

Whether or not you believe that we should put U.S. forces at risk to carry out this ground mission, namely to help extract UNPROFOR, if the decision is made—and as yet it has not been made by the United Nations nor NATO—I am certain that the Members of the U.S. Senate will want to support the President, and provide that aid that is necessary to perform the extraction of those troops from the ground areas.

I am also certain that every Senator in this Chamber would support funding to ensure that our forces are trained and equipped to facilitate that extraction. That is the type of thing we are talking about here.

Last year we had to provide a supplemental. There is no way the President nor the Secretary of Defense can anticipate the contingency operations and the level of funding associated with those operations. That is why we must fully fund the basic budget of the Department of Defense and rely less and less on the supplemental type of funding.

We learned in Operation Desert Storm that well-trained troops equipped with modern weapons and equipment suffer fewer casualties if they are properly trained, properly equipped, and properly supported logistically. That is what we are talking about in seeking this added funding.

I regret that the Senate did not adopt that amendment today, and somehow we will have to revisit this issue and do the very best we can to make sure that the men and women of the Armed Forces today are as equipped, trained, and otherwise supplied as we have done historically throughout these many years since World War II for our forces who volunteer, All Volunteer Forces.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Virginia. I agree with him wholeheartedly. I think when we are here on the floor debating some of the toughest decisions that we are ever going to make in our lifetime, that these things, like the defense budget that lost today on the floor, will be coming back. We will be able to continue to debate the role of defense, and I think when we finish this bill that we will see a little shifting of the priorities towards stronger national defense for just the reasons that the Senator from Virginia states, that we have things coming up that were unforeseen that are not put in the budget, like the need for American troops to help with the U.N. evacuation of Bosnia, which seems to be a possibility on the horizon.

But the point is that these things are going to happen, and we are going to have to budget in a way that allows for those eventualities and those emergencies.

So, I think the point here is that we are here tonight talking about some of the toughest decisions that we are ever going to make. We are trying to do the responsible thing.

I appreciate the Senator from Virginia and his leadership in the national defense area. I appreciate his coming out tonight to talk about those priorities.

So, I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if I could ask the Senator from Texas to yield just for a moment.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WARNER. We are fortunate that we have the services of the Senator from Texas on the Armed Services Committee. She was one of the three sponsors of the amendment today to try to adjust this funding upward. As we talked, she did so because of the briefings we had before the Armed Services Committee. Indeed, the Presiding Officer this evening is a member of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Pennsylvania. We have been briefed on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, an ever-increasing threat, the proliferation of short-range ballistic missiles.

We have also been advised by General Clapper, of the Defense Intelligence Agency, that there are no less than 60 geographic areas in the world today which he considers—repeat, which he considers—could erupt into the type of combat which might require the necessity for the intervention of our allies, or, indeed, possibly the United States.

So I thank the Senator from Texas for joining this debate tonight, and particularly commend her for her leadership today on an amendment to try to restore some of the funding.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I am very pleased to have him in support.

I want to yield the floor to the Senator from the State of Washington because I know he has been very active in the budget debate trying to save the Medicare system for the people of this country.

That is what we are doing. That is what we have been doing this week and what we are going to be doing in the next few days. We are going to be doing the things that are necessary to save the Medicare system so that when our future generations need this care, it will be there because we have done the responsible thing this week in the Senate.

So I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

A MOST CONSEQUENTIAL VOTE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, this Senate is now less than 24 hours from one of the most consequential votes it has taken literally in decades. Sometime late tomorrow, it will have the

opportunity for the first time in more than 25 years to vote for a budget resolution which will very clearly and very decisively put this country on a path to a balanced budget. Already, we have seen the positive impact of the very fact that this debate has begun. We have seen it in an increase once again in the value of the dollar, a value that collapsed on the occasion of the failure of the balanced budget amendment. We have seen it in lower interest rates, lower interest rates that mean that more and more Americans now can purchase the home of their dreams, can borrow money to begin or to expand a small business, can begin those businesses which will provide opportunities for others.

This has taken place just because for the first time the people of the United States believe that this new Congress, the House and the Senate, are serious about terminating a state of affairs in which each year we add \$200, \$250, and \$300 billion to the burdens imposed upon our children and grandchildren for spending for programs we are unwilling to pay for.

And yet, in spite of the lip service given by almost all Members to the abstract desirability of a balanced budget, resistance will continue in a rear guard action, in close votes on the floor of this body, from those who are absolutely dedicated to the status quo, who feel that while maybe it might be a good idea someday to have a balanced budget, not, O Lord, in our time, not with our votes. Or, if it is desirable to do it now, always in a different way than that proposed by what I confidently expect to be a majority of this body tomorrow evening.

Now, Mr. President, I do not think it appropriate for us to disguise the fact that there will be programs reduced, cut, the growth slowed in programs that provide desirable dollars for a wide range of interest groups in this country, and they will let their views be heard. They are represented eloquently by Members of this body who can see the trees or perhaps the leaves on the trees but not the forest itself, for whom a balanced budget, fiscal responsibility, the exercise of a moral responsibility to our children and grandchildren not further to subject them to debt is less important than a particular group or a particular program.

And so this contest which began at the beginning of this Congress and will reach one of its climactic votes tomorrow is a contrast between those who believe in, who speak for, who demand a different and more responsible direction for this country and those who, like the President of the United States, simply believe that the status quo is perfectly all right. Their view is the single worst thing we could possibly do would be to return a single dollar now being taken in the form of taxes from any group in the American people to the pockets of those American people even if that dollar came from a fiscal dividend resulting from a balanced

budget, came because we will pay less in interest on the national debt as interest rates decline, came because the economy grew and more people were at work at better jobs as a result of what we do.

It is ironic that the President's chief economic adviser, Laura Tyson, is quoted as having said recently,

Any effort to reduce Government spending takes a dollar out of the economy which means a dollar in reduction in demand in the economy so it increases the contractionary risks on the economy.

Mr. President, I think that states all too well the views of this administration and of those who oppose this budget resolution. Their view is that the only real prosperity comes from dollars spent by the Federal Government. In fact, that statement by Ms. Tyson is so extraordinary that one would expect her to suggest to us that we perhaps spend another \$100 billion during the course of this year borrowed from whoever would lend it to us because obviously that is the road to prosperity. If we cannot subtract \$1 billion because it will have a contractionary effect, presumably we add \$1 billion or \$10 billion or \$100 billion so we can spend our way into prosperity. But that is exactly what this administration has been doing, and it does not work.

Not only will this budget benefit the economy, not only will it mean more dollars in the pockets of individuals as they look to purchase their homes or start or expand their businesses or look for new opportunities, it will also mean a discipline on the Government itself. Perhaps we will not end up having 163 different and competing job training programs. Perhaps we will not have dozens or more of competing specific kinds of educational programs or subsidies for one business or group or another. Perhaps—and I am convinced this will be the case—we will use this budget to reform the Medicare health insurance fund so that it will actually be there in 7 years for the people who need that hospital insurance. Certainly this administration has ignored completely the voices of its own trustees of the Medicare hospital insurance fund who have told us and the administration that something must be done or that insurance fund will go bankrupt. But that is later; that is in the time of another President, another Congress; they can worry about it.

That seems to be the status-quo view which we are fighting so diligently to change.

So, Mr. President, it is well worth our while, well worth the while of those Senators who have chosen to be here this evening to take one last opportunity to speak to their colleagues and to the country about the radical change in direction that we propose, a direction of fiscal responsibility, a direction of exercising our responsibilities to future generations, a direction which can lead us to prosperity, a direction which can benefit every citizen in this country. That, on the one hand,

and, on the other hand, a passionate defense of the status quo: Nothing is wrong with this Government; all of the programs it has ought to be continued; we cannot do anything; we should go on automatic pilot.

That is a disappointing set of criticisms of our society today, Mr. President. It is not what last fall's election was about. I hope that with the help of the majority of my colleagues that tomorrow a majority in this U.S. Senate will put this country on a different path, a path that it has not trod for many years, a path to a better America.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

WAGING WAR AGAINST THE HUMAN SPIRIT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the budget resolution setting the spending levels for the next 5 years, we do so with the knowledge that one of our greatest challenges is moving the Nation's needy from governmental dependence to economic independence.

One of our challenges is to ensure that hope and opportunity are defining characteristics for all Americans. This was the challenge 30 years ago when the great movement reshaping world politics was the end of colonialism. John Kennedy celebrated the "desire to be independent," as the "single most important force in the world." Eventually this movement revealed its power from Asia to Africa to South America.

The problem with imperialism was not just its economic exploitation, it was its influence on culture. It undermined traditional ways and institutions, and it was inconsistent with human dignity.

Why? Because imperialism rewarded passivity and encouraged dependence, required citizens to live by the rules of a distant elite. It demanded people be docile in the face of a system that they could not change. It was an attack, not just on national sovereignty, but on national character.

What our Washington-based welfare system has done, particularly to women and children, has been to fashion a new form of colonialism. It created an underclass that is paid to play by the rules that lead to dependence, rather than act with independence and dignity. Our welfare system rewards behavior that keeps people powerless. It thwarts the efforts of private and religious charitable organizations to care for the needy. It discourages the genuine compassion of the American people. Our welfare system has waged a war against the human spirit.

Our goal in welfare should not be to maintain an "underclass" in as comfortable as possible circumstances. Yet that is precisely what our welfare system has done. Cash benefits anesthetize their suffering. Food stamps relieve their hunger. Health care and

housing are provided. But the hope, the dignity, and the integrity of independence are forgotten.

Consider, just briefly, what our current welfare system has wrought. The numbers alone are enough to numb the senses. Since 1965, we have spent more than \$5 trillion, a cost higher than that of waging the Second World War—fighting poverty. Yet today, there are more people, a greater percentage of Americans, living in poverty than ever before. And our safety net has not acted well, the safety net has become more like quicksand.

In 1965, when President Johnson launched the war on poverty, there were approximately 14.7 million children in poverty. They constituted about one in every five children in America. But in 1993, there was a greater percentage of children in poverty than there were in 1965 when the Great Society programs were launched. It is pretty clear that the Great Society experiment has not been so great for America's children.

Of all age groups in the nation today, children are the most likely to be poor. In 1991, a study of the poverty rates in eight industrialized nations revealed that American children were almost three times as likely to be poor as children from the other nations studied.

The character of the poverty we face today is also a more deeply entrenched poverty in which generations of people are born, live, and die without the experience of holding a job, of owning a home, or of growing up with a father's love and discipline.

Go to our inner cities—or just a few blocks from this building—and you will meet a generation fed on welfare and food stamps, but starved for nurture and hope. You will meet young teens in their third pregnancy. You will meet children who are not only without a father, but do not know any children with a father. You will talk with sixth graders who do not know how many inches there are in a foot—having never seen a ruler—and with first graders who do not know their ABC's because no one ever took the time to teach them.

The political elites that have spent and taxed in recent decades have redistributed wealth beyond the dreams of Roosevelt and Johnson combined. But in the Government's war on poverty, poverty is winning and the casualties are the poor, and the casualties are our children. The casualties also include the future, because we have piled budget after budget high with debt. Hope and opportunity are missing in action. Programs and policies that once were judged by the height of their spending must now be judged by the depth of their failure. This is no longer a source of serious debate, no longer a matter of partisan politics, but it is a matter of national concern—it is a concern that has been reflected in our news magazines, on the covers of U.S. News and Newsweek, and Time.